DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 861 UD 026 061

TITLE Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning Process 1985-86. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Educational Facilities Improvement; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Holistic Approach; Program Administration; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Staff Development; Staff Meetings; Staff Role; *Urban Education; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

During 1985-86, its first year, the Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning process (CSIP) operated in 156 of 392 New York City schools identified by the State Education Department's Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) as most in need of improvement. CSIP offers a holistic approach to school improvement and planning, and is designed to meet the rigorous guidelines for school improvement established in the CAR, as well as the Chancellor's Implementation Plan for Schools in Need of Assistance. The primary goal for the first year was for each school to submit a written, three-year plan presenting specific goals and activities designed to improve students' academic performance and the school's climate. Individual schools formed committees to write these plans, and CSIP facilitators assisted these committees in analyzing data, identifying problems, conducting surveys, and developing solutions. In general CSIP met its objectives. However, the programs had varying degrees of impact and acceptance across sites. The following recommendations are made: (1) principals and other staff should be made to realize that their commitment and participation is necessary for the success of CSIP; (2) planning committee members should have a common meeting during school hours, at least once a week; and (3) a program coordinator should be appointed. An appendix lists the chancellor's minimum standards for elementary, middle, and secondary schools. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
AND PLANNING PROCESS
1985-86

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Lutterberg
N.Y.C. Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

October, 1987

Robert Tobias, Administrator
John Schoener, Senior Manager

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND PLANNING PROCESS 1985-86

Prepared by
Instructional Support
Evaluation Unit

Frank Guerrero,
Evaluation Manager

Geraldine Chrein,
Evaluation Specialist

Jacqueline Perry,
Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report is the result of a collaborative effort on the part of full-time staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the title page, the unit is grateful to the following individuals for their able assistance: Janice Eidus, Sheila Moore, Elias Rosario, and Dan Hunt.

SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning process (CSIP) is administered by the New York City Board of Education's Office of Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning (OCSIP). During 1985-86, its first year, CSIP operated in 29 of New York City's community school districts. The 156 participating schools were among 392 area schools identified by the State Education Department (S.E.D.) in its Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR)* as most in need of improvement. The Chancellor's office established OCSIP and mandated that these schools participate in CSIP. Thirty-one OCSIP staff members, referred to as facilitators, went into the schools in order to assist with program implementation.

CSIP offers a holistic approach to school improvement and planning and is designed to meet the rigorous guidelines for school improvement established in the CAR as well as in the Chancellor's Implementation Plan for Schools in Need of Assistance.** The primary goal for the first year was for each school to submit a written, three-year plan presenting specific goals and activities designed to improve students' academic performance and the school's climate, in general. This plan would address these issues for three school years 1986-87, 1987-88, and 1988-89. Individual schools formed committees to write these plans, and CSIP facilitators assisted these committees in analyzing data, identifying problems, conducting surveys, and developing solutions.

EVALUATION METHODS

In-depth interviews with staff members was the primary method for collecting evaluation data. A team of evaluation consultants from the Office of Educational Assessment examined general activities in the schools, program goals and their outcomes. In addition, they conducted an overall assessment of the program and collected end-of-year documentation that detailed the general process of the program implementation.

---

*The Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) is prepared annually by S.E.D. It analyzes schools' performance on various tests administered by New York State. In addition, attendance figures and drop-out rates are also analyzed.

**The Chancellor's Implementation Plan for Schools In Need of Assistance was issued in February, 1986. It expands on the CAR in three ways: by defining the criteria by which schools will be evaluated more broadly, by recognizing improvement and by establishing minimum standards as a long-term strategy.

FINDINGS

In general CSIP met its objectives. All participating schools submitted written plans as required; the content of these plans varied, since individual schools focused on different areas of need and on different methods for improvement. Although all objectives were met, the program had varying levels of impact and acceptance across sites. In some schools, the implementation phase of the program had begun; in other schools, proposals for incentive grants to fund school improvement programs had been written; and in a few schools, attendance improved among students and staff members. In addition, in some schools, staff reported that the collaborative planning process helped to create a more positive environment within the school. Nevertheless, respondents indicated that since committee meetings took place before or after school hours, there was difficulty in scheduling meetings.

Based on the findings and other information presented in this report, the following recommendations are made:

- Facilitators and superintendents should impress upon principals and other staff that the success of CSIP is due in large part to their degree of commitment and participation.

- Planning Committee members should have a common meeting time during school hours, at least once a week.

- More support should be provided for the activities of facilitators to further ensure smooth program implementation, in the form of a program coordinator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	Program Background	1
	Participating Schools	2
	Program Goals	6
	Program Evaluation	7
	Scope of the Report	7
II.	Program Implementation	8
	Preparation for Implementation	8
	Chancellor's Profiles	9
	The Planning Process	9
	Program Entry	10
	School-wide Needs Assessment	11
	Planning Committee Formation	11
	Review and Summary of Needs Assessment	14
	Development of the School Improvement Plan	14
III.	Staff Development and Staff Perceptions of the Program	17
	Staff Hiring	17
	Staff Training	17
	Staff Perceptions of Training	18
	Staff Perceptions of The CSIP Program	18
	Staff Perceptions of Program Outcome	20
V.	Conclusions and Recommendations	22
	Appendix A	24

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1: Explanation of criteria Used by the State Education Department (S.E.D.) When Identifying Elementary and Intermediate-Junior High Schools in Need of Assistance. 3

Figure 2: Explanation of Identifying Criteria Used by the State Education Department (S.E.D.) When Identifying High Schools in Need of Assistance. 4

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning Process (CSIP) is a holistic, developmental, collaborative approach to school improvement and planning. Its aim is to raise students' achievement levels through an on-going, school-based collaborative planning process. CSIP is administered by the Office of Comprehensive School Improvement and Planning (OCSIP) which was established in September of 1985 by Chancellor Nathan Quinones to provide support and service for those 392 New York City schools identified by the New York State Education Department's Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR) as schools in need of assistance.

In 1985-86, its first year of operation, CSIP was funded by several grants including a State Incentive Grant of $ 938,000, an ECIA Chapter I grant of $ 1.7 million, and a special State Education Department Grant of $ 375,000.

OCSIP evolved from the consolidation of the School Improvement Project (SIP) and the Local School Development Project (L.S.D.P.).* Like its predecessors, OCSIP focuses on school-based planning as an effective means of improving student performance and the school climate. OCSIP has adapted the most successful elements of SIP and L.S.D.P. However, while both of the earlier programs involved the voluntary collaboration by school communities, the State Education Department (S.E.D.) has

---

*Evaluation reports on five years of school improvement projects are available from O.E.A.

mandated that all schools identified as Schools in Need of Assistance participate in CSIP.

The CSIP process promotes concern for the 11 School Correlates, identified by S.E.D.: the specification of academic goals; clearly defined curriculum goals; monitoring student progress; improvement of teacher effectiveness; administrative leadership; rewards and incentives; order and discipline; student responsibility and participation; parent and community involvement; positive school climate; and revision of school plan.

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

During the 1984-85 school year, the S.E.D. announced plans to establish criteria to identify the 600 lowest-achieving schools statewide using objective criteria for the years of 1982-85 as identified in the CAR report. This report provided student achievement data on state reading, and mathematics tests, and drop-out rates. Low achievement was identified as performance below a State Reference Point (S.R.P.), (See Figure 1). On the high school level, S.E.D. used identifying criteria based on the ranking of each school's profile data, which included reading, mathematics, writing scores, the dropout rate, and attendance figures for the school year 1983-84 (see Figure 2).

The Chancellor's Profiles were also issued to all schools and districts, and provided additional data that included: student attendance, writing test scores, and untoward incidents among other factors. While the S.E.D.'s CAR report provided

FIGURE 1

Explanation of Criteria Used by the State Education Department (S.E.D.) When Identifying Elementary and Intermediate/Junior High Schools in Need of Assistance[a]

GRADE	TEST	STATE REFERENCE POINT (S.R.P.)	S.E.D CRITERIA
3	Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) Reading, Degree of Reading Power (D.R.P.)	50 %ile	50 percent of tested students below the State Reference Point (S.R.P.). (Less than 50 percent at or above the S.R.P.)
3	PEP Mathematics	50 %ile	47 percent or more of tested students below the S.R.P. (Less than 53 percent at or above the S.R.P.)
6	PEP Reading (D.R.P.)	50 %ile	50 percent or more of tested students below the S.R.P. (Less them 50 percent at or above the S.R.P.)
8	P.C.T. Reading (D.R.P.)	39 %ile	23 percent or more of eighth-grade enrollment below the S.R.P. (Less than 77 percent at or above the S.R.P.)[b]
9	R.C.T. Mathematics	39 %ile	27 percent or more of ninth-grade enrollment failing in either January or June. (Less than 73 percent passing)[c]

[a]Elementary and intermediate/junior high schools in need of assistance were defined as those failing to meet one or more of the following criteria during the 1982-85 school year.

[b]Data presented in the Schools Profile are based on the number of students tested, scoring at or above the S.R.P. Data used by the S.E.D. were based on the number of students enrolled in grade 8.

[c]Data presented in the Schools Profile are based on the number of students tested in June each year. Data used by the S.E.D. were based on the number of failures in January and June divided by ninth-grade enrollment.

FIGURE 2

Explanation of Identifying Criteria Used by the State Education Department (S.E.D.) When Identifying High Schools in Need of Assistance[a]

GRADE	TEST	STATE REFERENCE POINT	S.E.D. CRITERIA
9-12	Regent Competency Test (R.C.T.) Mathematics	50 %ile	27 percent or more of tested students below the State Reference Point (S.R.P.). (Less than 73 percent at or above the S.R.P.)[b]
11	R.C.T. Reading	50 %ile	21 percent or more of the tested students below the S.R.P. (Less than 79 percent at or above the S.R.P.)[b]
11-12	R.C.T. Writing	-	21 percent or more of tested students below the S.R.P. (Less than 79 percent at or above the S.R.P.)[b]
9-12	Drop-out Rate	-	10 percent or higher drop-out rate[c]

[a]High schools in need of assistance were defined as those failing to meet one or more of the following criteria during the 1982-85 school year:

[b]Data used by the S.E.D. were based on the number of failures in January and June.

[c]Data used by S.E.D. were based on total enrollment of students during the school year.

information regarding the performance levels of schools in comparison to one another, the goal of the Chancellor's Profiles was to specifically outline a complete and uniform set of objective data about each school.

Before the state made a formal announcement concerning the Schools in Need of Assistance in September, 1985, the New York City Board of Education anticipated that approximately 150 local Schools would appear on the S.E.D. list. Consequently, fiscal budget planning for the 1985-86 school year took into consideration the needs of 150 schools. However, the S.E.D. report subsequently identified 392 local schools in need.

The final OCSIP budget allowed for a program serving a total of 170 schools on all grade levels, therefore, the New York City Board of Education held the OCSIP director accountable only for serving these particular schools. All the schools in Need of Assistance, including the remaining 222 other CAR area schools not fully served by OCSIP, had to comply with all S.E.D. guidelines and mandates. The Chancellor required that goals and objectives be written in these schools. In addition these schools were expected to develop school-based planning committees, to assess the needs of their schools, to write school improvement plans and to implement their plans. Most of the other CAR schools requested and received technical assistance from OCSIP to fulfill their requirements.

Each year, schools will receive new profiles from the Chancellor and new CAR reports from the S.E.D. All schools are

expected to review their data and to continue to plan to meet the standards established by the Chancellor's Commission on Minimum Standards.

PROGRAM GOALS

In order to meet the overall aim of OCSIP, which is to improve the academic performance of students, as well as the school climate, each school formed a planning committee, representative of all school constituency groups including teachers, administrators, students, auxiliary personnel, and parents. These planning committees were responsible for the development of a written, three-year plan for the years 1986-87, 1987-88, and 1988-89 (in compliance with S.E.D. guidelines) to address the assessed needs of the school. OCSIP's major goal in 1985-86 was to help to produce this plan.

OCSIP employed and trained a staff of 31 experienced educators as facilitators and change agents at these target schools. These OCSIP facilitators worked with the planning committees, guiding the committees through the first five steps of an eight-step sequential process outlined by CSIP. This process included: 1) Program Entry; 2) Schoolwide Needs Assessment; 3) Planning Committee Formation; 4) Review and Summary of Needs Assessment; 5) Development of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan; 6) Plan Implementation; 7) Plan Evaluation; and 8) Maintenance and Institutionalization. Specifically, each facilitator provided assistance to planning committees in analyzing data in order to identify problems

underlying poor student performance and school conditions, assessing school needs through survey analysis, and in developing a problem-solving agenda.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

The 1985-86 evaluation of CSIP, conducted by the Office of Educational Assessment/Instructional Support Evaluation Unit (O.E.A./I.S.E.U.), was based primarily on end-of-year interviews with the project manager, the program director, and selected facilitators. In addition, the end of the year reports submitted by facilitators to the assistant director were examined. The following issues were investigated in the evaluation: the training procedures, roles, and activities of facilitators; the impact of CSIP on the school communities; and the effectiveness of the planning committees.

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

Following this introduction and overview, Chapter II discusses the implementation and organization of OCSIP; Chapter III discusses staff development and staff perceptions of the program, including outcomes; and Chapter IV offers conclusions and recommendations aimed at program improvement.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PREPARATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN THE SCHOOLS

Announcement of Schools.

In December, 1985, the New York City Board of Education disclosed the schools that had been identified by the State as performing below minimum standards and in Need of Assistance. School superintendents were then required to publicly identify these schools and, more specifically, to identify which schools were selected to receive direct OCSIP service. Principals introduced the concept of school-based planning to the other constituencies of the school community, after receiving a briefing from the OCSIP facilitator.

Out of a total of 32 school districts in the New York City school system, only three districts had no schools identified by the state. The number of schools identified at each level as performing inadequately were: 237 elementary; 101 intermediate/junior high; and 54 high schools. The OCSIP staff had hoped to implement the program in the schools by November, 1985. But because announcements were made late in the school year, close to the holiday season, CSIP was unable to operate fully in the schools until January, 1986. As a result of the late starting date, not only did CSIP have the difficulty of structuring the state-mandated plan, it also had the additional pressure of reduced time to accomplish its goals.

Chancellor's Profiles.

Each of the elementary and intermediate/junior high schools performing below minimum standards received its school's profile data for all grades for a three-year period (school years 1982, 1983, and 1984) detailing student performance on city/state reading, writing, and mathematics tests. The dropout rate, where applicable, was also made known. The high schools also received profile data for all grades detailing student performance in the same academic areas and the drop-out rate for a five-year period beginning in 1979 and concluding with 1984.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

The CSIP process includes eight sequential components, organized in three phases: Phase I, committee formation and plan development, Phase II, plan implementation, and Phase III, maintenance and institutionalization. In this first year, facilitators guided schools through the first five steps of the eight-component process.

- Program Entry: The program's concept is introduced to the school communities by CSIP facilitators.
- Schoolwide Needs Assessment: The strengths and weaknesses of each school are identified. Tools used include the Comprehensive Assessment Report (CAR), and the Chancellor's Implementation Plan.
- Planning Committee Formation: Teachers, students, administrators, auxiliary personnel, etc., are selected by peers to participate as committee members.
- Review and Summary of Needs Assessment: Committee members form subcommittees to plan strategies that addressing specific areas of need.

- Development of the School Improvement Plan: Each school committee is responsible for a written, three-year improvement plan. Each objective for improvement must be clearly defined. These plans must include strategies to develop resources for the program's implementation, information on program activities, and evaluation criteria assessing the program's effectiveness.

Program Entry

This is an orientation phase, designed to create an awareness of Effective Schools research and the CSIP process among the various school constituencies of the school community. After this introduction, the facilitator provided a more detailed overview of the steps involved in the planning process. Each of the 31 CSIP facilitators was assigned approximately five of the 170 participating schools. Usually, each facilitator worked with schools located within one or two districts. In addition, those facilitators with an extensive background in staff development provided technical or advisory assistance on request to other schools which had been identified as falling below minimum standards but which were not participating in CSIP.

During the initial phase, facilitators first met with the superintendents and other appropriate district personnel, including liaisons to the schools, specialists, and/or consultants. In some districts, facilitators met with the principals as a group before visiting the participating schools. Every effort was made to clearly present CSIP's agenda and intentions. Some facilitators, however, reported that at these initial meetings, some superintendents, principals, and other

staff members were demoralized because their schools had been publicly identified as performing inadequately. In addition, facilitators noted that when school principals were unenthusiastic about CSIP, committee formation and planning committee meetings did not go as smoothly as possible. Nevertheless, facilitators said that over time, most of these negative feelings faded because school constituents began to feel that it was truly a collaborative process; everyone's input was needed and respected; and the goal of having each school complete a written, three-year plan was met.

School-wide Needs Assessment

CSIP committee members and facilitators assessed school needs based on the CAR and the Chancellor's Profiles. The needs assessment process is a research process, designed to give each school a clear idea of its strengths and weaknesses. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to staff, administrators, students, parents, and auxiliary personnel. These questionnaires were designed to tap their perceptions of the Eleven Correlates of Effective Schools, as they operated in their schools and to determine the areas in which additional training would be welcomed.

Planning Committee Formation

Composition. In accordance with CSIP guidelines, the planning committee at most schools was composed of a representative sample of all school constituencies including: students; parent association members; teachers representing

various grade levels, programs, and departments; the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.); and support and auxiliary staff. Assistant principals, principals, and CSIP facilitators were members, as well. An equitable selection process acceptable to all segments of the schools community is essential. Committee members questioned indicated that they had come to the committee in a variety of ways: many had volunteered, others were asked to join by school administrators, and other members reported they were elected by the committee. Principals and U.F.T. chairpersons were required to join. Attendance at committee meetings varied, but, in general, attendance was high.

Subcommittee Formation. Each school had at least three active subcommittees in at least three required areas, most often: 1) the curriculum, which always included reading, writing, and mathematics, and occasionally included other subjects if these were part of the needs assessment; 2) environment, which included discipline and rewards and incentives for students; and 3) organization, which included teacher effectiveness and school management. Those schools with additional areas of need formed subcommittees to address these areas, as well.

Meetings. The CSIP planning committees met approximately twice each month and in some cases once a week. Meetings were usually held before or after school hours, lasting at least one or two hours. In some cases, meetings lasted longer than two hours. The frequency, schedule, and duration of the meetings

depended on the needs and availability of participants. The subcommittees, however, met only during school hours. The frequency of these meetings varied from school to school. In general, each subcommittee met as needed from as little as one to as much as five times weekly. Facilitators did not usually attend subcommittee meetings. Meetings for both the planning committees and the subcommittees began in most schools in January or February, 1986.

Roles on Committees. During committee meetings, the facilitator was responsible for keeping the groups task-oriented and for guiding them through the process of completing the written plan. The facilitators were participant-observers. They maintained a neutral stance and sought to deal equitably with all members of the committee. They encouraged everyone to participate fully and helped to ensure that all concerns were given equal consideration.

Each committee and subcommittee was headed by an elected chairperson. The chairpersons were trained by the facilitators to officiate at meetings. The most important duties of the chairperson included formulating an agenda with other committee members; establishing priorities for each meeting; monitoring the proceedings to ensure that goals were clarified; maintaining records; conducting briefings at the end of meetings to summarize outcomes; and coordinating subcommittee agendas with subcommittee chairpersons. The subcommittee chairpersons were responsible for ensuring that the school-wide community knew about CSIP

developments. Often this information was posted on the faculty bulletin board.

In addition, each planning committee and each subcommittee appointed or elected someone to the position of recorder. Recorders' duties included documenting decisions on prepared decision sheets; duplicating and distributing decision sheets and other pertinent data to committee members; and maintaining files of all CSIP information.

Review and Summary of Needs Assessment

Committee members formed subcommittees to plan strategies addressing specific areas of need and to assist in the review and planning process. A needs assessment profile was drawn up based on CAR data. This profile was presented to facilitators who then discussed it with committee members. In addition, the entire school-wide community was made aware of the results of the profile. In general, responses to these profiles varied from school to school. In some cases, there was unanimous agreement concerning areas of need and strategies for improvement. In other cases, committee members questioned both the accuracy and usefulness of the profiles. Some committees agreed to use it only as a general guide. In all cases, committees prioritized the strategies and activities in order to facilitate the writing of the three-year improvement plan.

Development of the School Improvement Plan

The deadline set by the state for submission of the written

school improvement plan was April 30, 1986. State-issued guidelines mandated that the following subjects be addressed in the plan: a listing of areas of need in order of priority; how areas of need were determined; a listing of goals in order of priority; specific objectives which would enable schools to achieve goals; specific activities designed to address specific areas of need; a time-frame for the execution of these specific activities; needed and available resources; specific mention of who would assume responsibility for implementation of delineated activities; and criteria for measurement of achievement.

The state requirements applied to grades three, six, eight, and nine for the elementary, intermediate and junior high schools, and for grades nine through twelve for high schools. The Chancellor's Report, however, required that schools provide the above information for all grade levels of the elementary, intermediate, and junior high schools.

Various portions of the plan were developed and written at subcommittee meetings. Then, the entire planning committee reconvened to critique the work of the subcommittees and to further develop, write, and refine the plan. This ongoing process continued until the written plan was completed.

The comprehensive school plans were submitted to the state in May, 1986. During the month of June, 1986, S.E.D. and CSIP staff reviewed the plans. CSIP staff examined the plans for adherence to format and general content. S.E.D. staff prepared a written analysis of each section, determining the feasibility of

goals, objectives, implementation, and evaluation. In some cases, committees were asked to revise plans in order to make them more focused.

III. STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

STAFF HIRING

Despite the fact that a new director was hired for OCSIP in early spring, 1986, the hiring of facilitators went smoothly. Thirty-one facilitators were hired. Some of these facilitators had previously worked for SIP and L.S.D.P. Others were newly hired.

The facilitators had varied backgrounds in educational instruction, administration, and staff development. While all staff members were required to have a minimum of five years teaching and/or administrative experience, most facilitators had many more years of experience in these areas.

STAFF TRAINING

Formal training of facilitators began in October, 1985. Emphasis was placed on "process tools." These process tools included strategies for conducting meetings, using arbitration techniques, and helping to provide positive working relationships among the different factions of the school-wide community. Other subjects focused on during training included techniques in management and documentation. Several outside consultants conducted workshops in academic areas such as reading, mathematics, and writing in order to help facilitators become thoroughly familiar with various teaching approaches to these subjects. Training sessions were led by both OCSIP's director

manager, as well as by those facilitators with expertise in particular areas of staff development.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING

In general, facilitators reported to O.E.A.'s evaluation team that they found the training in process tools the most valuable part of the training sessions. Some facilitators found the overall training very good; others found it adequate. Some facilitators would have liked more "hands-on" training, especially more role-playing. The one facilitator who stated that the training was inadequate believed that only on-the-job experience would be beneficial.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE CSIP PROGRAM

Program Strengths

O.E.A. evaluators spoke to facilitators about the strengths of the CSIP program. In general, facilitators found the CSIP program to be exemplary largely because of the nature of the collaborative planning. One facilitator summarized an assessment of CSIP in this way: "In many cases, people who had never sat down together to discuss problems and solutions were now learning to listen to each other, and to come to a consensus on issues which previously were only areas of complaint." Another facilitator felt that CSIP had enabled "the school to have control over its own destiny." Respondents were enthusiastic about the strong leadership and guidance provided by both the program director and manager. The program director, who was also

interviewed, stated that most facilitators performed their duties admirably and maintained commendable professionalism under pressure and sometimes adverse circumstances.

Program Weaknesses

The project manager expressed concern about not having sufficient time to effectively monitor support of the activities of all 31 in all the boroughs. The program director expressed a similar view and suggested that several coordinator positions be created. These coordinators would then monitor and support the activities of the facilitators. In addition, other members of the school-wide community suggested that a better monitoring system be used in order to "help morale" and ensure that the activities of all facilitators benefited the program.

Facilitators suggested that the following improvements be made:

- common time should be created during the week for planning members to meet during school hours;
- fewer school assignments should be given to each facilitator to allow more time in individual schools;
- additional funds should be designated for the Implementation Phase of CSIP;
- more in-depth training should be given to facilitators, most specifically in using process tools; and,
- communication between the city and state agencies affiliated with CSIP, as well as between CSIP and the district offices, should be improved.

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Since formal mechanisms to evaluate the program had not yet been put into effect, staff perceptions of outcomes were sought. Staff cited these outcomes:

- all schools completed written plans and, in many schools, the preliminary stages of the Implementation Phase had been completed before the end of the 1986 school year;
- special programs developed by planning committees were smoothly integrated into existing programs;
- in one school, teachers and students established a mini-school designed to facilitate CSIP implementation;
- proposals for incentive grants were written, and in some schools, planning teams received funding;
- the overall climate in many schools became more positive, due to the collaborative planning process;
- relationships between principals and other staff improved;
- newly-developed instructional handbooks for students and teachers were used; and,
- attendance for staff and students improved in some schools.

Future Goals

In September, 1986, participating schools will begin the most significant and complex phase of the school improvement process; the implementation and operationalization of their CSIP plans. The Plan Evaluation, Maintenance and Institutionalization Phases of the program will follow. OCSIP has established a number of measures to ensure efficient fulfillment of the final phases. These measures also seek to address the concerns of program staff.

The number of facilitators has increased to a total of 54, and an effort has been made to limit each assignment to a single district. Four coordinator positions have been added to the staff. These coordinators, along with the directors and managers, will monitor the activities of the 54 facilitators.

In addition, OCSIP plans a city-wide training for all chairpersons and recorders in participating schools. Thus, when facilitators take on a less active role over time, chairpersons and recorders will be better prepared to institutionalize CSIP in their schools.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

During its first year, the primary goal for CSIP was that all participating schools complete a written, three-year plan; this goal was met. Since formal mechanisms to evaluate the program have not yet been put into effect, staff perceptions of outcomes were sought. In some schools, special programs developed by the planning committees were smoothly integrated into existing programs. In one school, teachers and students established a mini-school, designed to facilitate CSIP implementation. The CSIP plans required additional resources for the implementation phase, and in many schools proposals for incentive grants were written and for some schools they were approved and funded. Although committees met on a regular basis in most schools, members requested a common meeting time to insure future meetings. In addition, the overall climate in many schools improved significantly because the collaborative planning process gave the staff an opportunity to make changes and work together towards a common goal. In general, when principals were supportive, school constituents felt more positive about the progress they are making.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings and other information presented in this report, the following recommendations are aimed at enhancing program effects and guiding them during the implementation phase:

- Facilitators and superintendents should impress upon principals and other staff that the success of CSIP is due in large part to their degree of commitment and participation.

- Planning committee members should have a common meeting time during school hours, at least once a week.

- The position of program coordinator should be established to provide more support for the activities of facilitators and to further ensure smooth program implementation.

Appendix A: Chancellor's Minimum Standards

Taken from: Foundation for Academic Excellence, (May 1986), distributed by the Office of Comprehensive School Improvement and planning.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MINIMUM STANDARDS

CHANCELLOR'S CRITERIA	RECOMMENDED STANDARDS
• Reading	
Grade 3	At least 60% read at or above State Reference Point (50th percentile)
Grade 6	At least 65% read at or above State Reference Point (50th percentile)
Grades 2, 4, 5	Progress standards to be determined using new test data (September, 1986)
• Mathematics	
Grade 3	At least 65% score at or above State Reference Point
Grade 6	At least 65% score at or above State Reference Point
Grades 2, 4, 5	Progress standards to be determined using new test data (September, 1986)
• Attendance	Every school has an average daily attendance rate of at least 90%

MIDDLE SCHOOL
MINIMUM STANDARDS

CHANCELLOR'S CRITERIA	RECOMMENDED STANDARDS
• Reading	
Grade 8	At least 80% score at or above State Reference Point (39th percentile)
Grades 7 and 9	Progress standards to be determined using new test data (September, 1986)
• Mathematics	
Grade 9	At least 70% pass RCT or Regents (at least 25% pass Regents)
Grade 7	Progress standard to be determined using new test data (September, 1986)
Grade 8	Fixed standard to be determined using new test data (September, 1986)
• Attendance	Every school has an average daily attendance rate of at least 85%
• Promotion Rate	New indicator to be developed

HIGH SCHOOL
MINIMUM STANDARDS

Note: The Executive Director of the High School Division will set Higher Standards for Specialized/Educational Option Schools.

CHANCELLOR'S CRITERIA	RECOMMENDED STANDARDS
• Reading	a. 100% of twelfth graders pass RCTs or Regents b. At least 30% meet requirement by passing Regents c. Progress standards in Grades 9 and 10 to be determined (September, 1986)
• Mathematics	a. At least 70% pass RCT or Regents in Grade 9 (at least 25% pass Regents) b. At least 80% pass RCT or Regents in Grade 10 (at least 25% pass Regents) c. At least 90% pass RCT or Regents in Grade 11 (at least 25% pass Regents) d. 100% pass RCT or Regents in Grade 12 (at least 25% pass Regents)
• Graduation Rate	At least 90% of eligible candidates graduate (January - June - August)
• Regents-Endorsed Diplomas	At least 15% of graduates receive Regents-Endorsed Diplomas
• Dropout Rate	No school's dropout rate is above 7.5% annually
• Attendance	a. Every school has an average daily attendance rate of at least 85% b. No more than 20% absent 16 or more days per semester c. No more than 5% Long Term Absentees